UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,380	01/26/2001	Shinichi Nojima	1614.1119	5766

21171 7590 04/07/2006	EXAMINER
STAAS & HALSEY LLP	SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/769,380	NOJIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 January 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1)   This is a Non-Final rejection in response to the Amendments/Remarks filed on

1/18/06.

2)   Claims 1-25 are pending and rejected.

3)   Examiner withdraws the rejection under 35 USC 112 because the Applicant

explains more clearly the interpretation of the claim limitation in issue (see Remarks

section, page 10, 4th paragraph "a character string is being input by the character input

function and the detecting section detects a keyword from the character string that is

being input").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4)   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4-1)   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 25, for the claim language "receiving". It is unclear how or

where the receiving is taking place. It can be interpreted to say that the method is

receiving from the user or the method is receiving from another automated source.

The language "selecting at least one program while defining characters of the character

string" can be interpreted in various ways. First, the claim is not clear as to who or what

entity is doing the selection (ie., computer, processor or human). Second, for the claim

language "while" does not clear as to whether the selection will be happening

simultaneously with the defining or in sequence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5-1)   Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11 and 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over by <u>Ceantar</u> (<u>http://www.ceantar.org/dicts/search.html</u>.

(Published April 1998), in view of <u>Hatakeyama</u> et al (US 5469354, issued Nov

1995).

Regarding claims 1,4,8,11 and 14-24, Ceantar teaches *detecting section*

detecting a keyword which is specified by one or more input characters (ie., 'search for'

field) and

a display section displaying dictionaries when the keyword indicating registered

dictionaries when the keyword is detected by said detecting section (ie., section under

'select the dictionary (or dictionaries) to search') and

an issuing section issuing a search request…. Dictionary search program (ie.,

button 'Start Search').

Ceantar teaches the currently added limitations *"wherein said issuing section*

issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect

to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined". For example, Ceantar discloses a list of dictionaries that the user can select to search at the time of entering a search word to search the words in the dictionary (ie., MacBain's, MacFarlane's, Kelly's and Gramadach)(see Ceantar reference, top portion).

Ceantar does not teach, but Hatakeyama teaches

From a character string that is being input by the character input function (ie., search for a given search term in a character string for inclusion of the term in the string)(col 3, lines 50-65)(ie., inputted search term)(col 3,lines 24-30);

Keyword detecting (ie., search facility that checks for inclusion of word)(col 3, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include searching for a search term in a character string as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

Regarding claim 2, Ceantar teaches "issuing section ... define the input characters" (ie., user can check in the check box next to the plurality of dictionaries to search for the word indicted in the 'search for' window).

Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Hatakeyama teaches

Of the character string (ie., character strings ...)(col 3, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include character string as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

Regarding claim 25, Ceantar teaches receiving a character string. For example, the 'search for' field in a dictionary search program (see Ceantar, middle).

Ceantar teaches selecting at least one program while defining characters of the character string. For example, Ceantar discloses a list of dictionaries that he user can select to search at the time of entering a search word to search the words in the dictionary (ie., MacBain's, MacFarlane's, Kelly's and Gramadach)(see Ceantar reference, top portion).

Ceantar does not expressly teach displaying output from the program (although it is inherent because when a user searches, they expect results displayed), but Hatakeyama does suggest the displaying of output. For example, Hatakeyama discloses a search query processing program that displays results to users (col 35, lines 40-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include displaying search query results as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

5-2)   Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Ceantar</u> (as cited above), in view of <u>Hatakeyama</u> et al (as cited above), further in view of <u>Brown</u> et al (US 6665838 B1, filed Jul 30, 1999).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama does not expressly teach, but Brown teaches "a registering section... interactive process" (ie., server sends the page and the set of thumbnails to the client ... responsive to finding the user criteria on a linked page within the set of linked pages, the server modifies the page to indicate the presence of the user criteria on the linked page and sends a modified page to the client)(col 2, lines 23-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama to include a server retrieving the page and generating a set of thumbnails in the database and sending the page and the set of thumbnails to the client as taught by Brown, providing the benefit a search engine for internet users to enable them to make more informed decisions about which link to follow and present a method for presenting content from the page in a distributed database upon receiving a request from a client for a page (col 2, lines 15-21; lines 24-26).

5-3)   Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Ceantar</u> (as cited above), in view of <u>Hatakeyama</u> (as cited above), further in view of <u>Brandt</u> et al (US 6377993 B1, filed Sep 24, 1998).

Regarding claims 6, 12, Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama does not expressly teach, but Brandt teaches *displays a program (including conversion program) ... cannot*

be started(including cannot convert)(ie., metadata format ... if errors are found in the input, the RM returns an error message to the requesting client; fail due to insufficient or missing data .. result in error messages being sent to the report manager or local log when request message cannot be parsed due to bad data or invalid format.. invalid request format or parameter...)(col 15, lines 1-12; col 25, lines 51-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama to check for format errors in the input and return an error message to the client for bad or invalid format as taught by Brandt, providing the benefit of an internet/intranet/web-based data management tool that provides a common GUI enabling the requesting of various types of data, enables customers to access relevant data information timely, rapidly and accurately through the GUI client interface, enable secure initiation of data reports (Brands, abstract section).

5-4)   Claims 3, 7, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Ceantar</u> (as cited above), in view of <u>Hatakeyama</u> (as cited above), further in view of <u>Tran</u> et al (US 6157935, Filed Dec 17, 1996).

Regarding claims 3, 7, 10 and 13, Ceantar not expressly teach, but Hatakeyama teaches *Of the character string* (ie., fragmental character strings resulting from the decomposition ... character strings)(col 3, lines 64-65).

Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama does not expressly teach, but Tran teaches an *ending section ... input characters* (ie., stop button cancels the loading of a page)(col 21, lines 29-30);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Ceantar to include character strings as taught by Hatakeyama,

providing the benefit of speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database

(Hatakeyama, col 3, lines 40-46) with Japanese text (Hatakeyama, col 4, line 37; col 7,

lines 14-21), further to include a stop button to cancel the loading of a page as taught by

Tran, providing the benefit of significant productivity gains in modeling complex data

(Tran, col 1, lines 60-65) for remote data access and management systems (title) and

enhance the efficiency of field personnel (Tran, col 2, lines 45-50) using a graphical

user interface with icons and menus across the top for retrieval purposes, which guide

the user through cyberspace in a linear manner, where the user is not hampered by

delays on-line (Tran, col 21, lines 23-49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Applicant argues (Remarks, bottom page 10 and all of page 11) that

Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama does not teach the added limitation of "wherein said

issueing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the

keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets

during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined". The

Examiner disagrees and rejects this added limitation under Ceantar. For example,

Ceantar discloses a list of dictionaries that the user can select at the time of entering a

search word to search the words in the dictionary (ie., MaBain's dictionary,

MacFarlane's dictionary, Kelly's dictionary and Gramadach dictionary)(see Ceantar, top

portion of the 1st page).

Applicant argues (on page 11) that the new claim, 25, is not taught by the

references. The Examiner disagrees and rejects the new claim under Ceantar in view

of Hatakeyama. Specifically, Ceantar discloses a list of dictionaries that he user can

select to search at the time of entering a search word to search the words in the

dictionary (ie., MacBain's, MacFarlane's, Kelly's and Gramadach)(see Ceantar

reference, top portion) and Hatakeyama discloses a search query processing program

that displays results to users (col 35, lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include

displaying search query results as taught by Hatakeyama, providing the benefit of

speeding up the full text search of a large scale text database (col 3, lines 40-46) with

Japanese text (col 4, line 37; col 7, lines 14-21).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-

4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.S
3/30/06
GS

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4/3/2006